100200239-1   10/052,612

REMARKS

This amendment is filed as a full and timely response to the final Official Action mailed March 20, 2006. Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Request for Continued Examination:

Applicant hereby requests Continued Examination for this application and entry and consideration of this amendment consequent thereto.

Claim Status:

Various claims have been amended. No claims are added or cancelled. Claim 7 has been cancelled previously. Thus, claims 1-6 and 8-31 are currently pending for further action.

Applicant wishes to note that the amendments made by the present paper were suggested by the Examiner in a telephone conference with the undersigned conducted April 17, 2006. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his helpful consideration and suggestions regarding this application.

Prior Art:

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 17 and 21 were rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the combined teachings of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,110 to Motoyama ("Motoyama") and U.S. Patent No. 6,128,646 to Miloslavsky ("Miloslavsky"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

9

100200239-1   10/052,612

Claim 1 recites

    A computer network for providing services comprising:
    a plurality of computing elements each of which comprises computing
resources for supporting one or more electronic services, *wherein said services are
controlled or operated by commands or data transmitted via email*;
    a mail server for receiving and routing email; and
    a redirector, separate from said mail server, communicatively connected to
said mail server and each of said computing elements, wherein said redirector receives
email from said mail server, wherein each e-mail contains a command or data for a
specific said service, with or without being addressed to a specific computing element,
and *wherein said redirector is configured to selectively match an available computing
element with a specific service request of an incoming e-mail and forward at least a
portion of the email to that computing element so as to deliver said command or data
to that specific service*, such that said redirector serves as an email proxy for said
plurality of computing elements;
    wherein said electronic services are controlled by said email routed by said
redirector among said plurality of computing elements.
(emphasis added).

As established previously, Motoyama does not teach or suggest both a "mail server"

and "a redirector, separate from said mail server, communicatively connected to said mail

server and each of said computing elements, wherein said redirector receives email from said

mail server" as an email proxy for the plurality of computing elements." This fact is

conceded by the recent Office Action. (Action of 3/20/06, p. 3). Consequently, the Office

Action cites to the teachings of Miloslavsky to supplement the failings of Motoyama.

According to the Office Action, Miloslavsky teaches the claimed combination of a mail

server and redirector.

However, the teachings of Miloslavsky are entirely inapposite to the current claims.

Miloslavsky teaches a "system for routing electronic mails to one of a plurality of support

persons in a processing center is disclosed. Each person has a skill set that is suitable for

responding to a certain type of e-mails. The system comprises an e-mail server for receiving

the e-mail from a sender, an information extractor for extracting relevant information from

10

the e-mail, and a router for routing the e-mail. The system contains a database for storing information related to all persons who can answer e-mails." (Miloslavsky, abstract).

In contrast, claim 1 does not teach or suggest the combination of a mail server and redirector for routing emails to human members of a support staff. Rather, claim 1 is directed to a "computer network for providing [electronic] services ... wherein said services are controlled or operated by commands or data transmitted via email." Accordingly, claim 1 recites a redirector that receives email from a mail server, where the mail contains a command or data for a specific electronic service. The redirector then "match[es] an available computing element with a specific service request of an incoming e-mail and forward[s] at least a portion of the email to that computing element so as to deliver said command or data to that specific service."

None of this subject matter is taught or suggested by the combination of Motoyama and Miloslavsky. "To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 11 similarly recites:

> A method of providing services with a computer network that comprises a plurality of computing elements each of which comprise computing resources for supporting one or more services that are controlled or operated by commands or data received via email, and a redirector, communicatively connected to each of said computing elements; said method comprising:
> receiving an e-mail message, said message containing a command or data configured for a specific service on one of said computing elements, wherein said e-mail message relates to said specific service, with or without being addressed to a specific computing element; and

11

> *routing at least some of said e-mail message comprising said command or data to a corresponding computing element to control or execute said specific service,* such that said redirector serves as an e-mail proxy for said computing elements, wherein said redirector determines which computing element receives said command or data from said e-mail message based on the specific service to which that e-mail message relates.

(emphasis added)

In contrast, the combination of Motoyama and Miloslavsky fails to teach or suggest that "routing at least some of said e-mail message comprising said command or data to a corresponding computing element to control or execute said specific service." As demonstrated above, the combination of Motoyama and Miloslavsky merely teaches the routing of email to various members of a human support staff.

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka,* 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 11 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 4-6, 10, 13-15, 19, 20 and 22-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combined teachings of Motoyama, Miloslavsky and U.S. Patent No. 4,80,901 to Weber ("Weber"). For at least the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 26 recites:

> A computer network for providing electronic services comprising:
> a plurality of computing elements each of which comprises computing resources for supporting one or more electronic services, wherein said services can be controlled or executed by commands or data transmitted via email; and
> a service handler on at least one of said computing elements for automatically obtaining an electronic service using an incoming email and installing that service on the computing element corresponding to the service handler.

The combination of cited prior art does not teach or suggest a service handler on a computing element "for automatically obtaining an electronic service using an incoming

12

100200239-1   10/052,612

email and installing that service on the computing element corresponding to the service handler." Nothing in the combination of cited prior art teaches or suggests using an email message to obtain, e.g., download, an "electronic service" and then install that service on a corresponding computing element.

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 26 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In addition to the foregoing, the various dependent claims in the application recite further subject matter that is clearly patentable over the prior art of record. Specific examples follow.

Claim 2 recites: "each of said plurality of computing elements comprises a service handler; and said service handler on a computing element extracts an access function from an incoming email message and complies with said extracted access function." Similar subject matter is recited in claims 12-15. Applicant's specification defines an "access function" as follows:

> The service handler (50) then performs an access function or command that is specified in the email message (40). One example of an access function specified in the email message (40) is a command to invoke a service (52). Another example of an access function is a command or data input to the service (52) after service (52) is invoked. An example of a command is a command that causes the service (52) to return log data to a return email address.

(Applicant's specification, paragraph 0022).

13

This subject matter does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art of record. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claims 2 and 12-15 should reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 4 recites: "said redirector comprises a service handler for extracting an access function from incoming email messages; and said service handler complies with said extracted access function by transmitting commands or data to said plurality of computing elements supporting said services." Again, this subject matter does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art of record. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 4 should reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 8 recites: "a firewall through which said email messages are received, said mail server and redirector both being protected within a common firewall." Similar subject matter is recited by claim 17. Again, this subject matter does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art of record. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claims 8-10 and 17-19 should reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 20 recites: "generating web pages for a web client with said redirector, said web pages being related to said services." Again, this subject matter does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art of record. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claims 20 should reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 21 recites: "sending a response email message following compliance with said extracted access function." Again, this subject matter does not appear to be taught or

14

suggested by the prior art of record. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claims 21 should reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 22 recites: "wherein said redirector is configured to extract a service from an incoming email and launch said extracted service on one of said computing elements." Similar subject matter is taught by claim 27. Again, this subject matter does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art of record. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claims 22, 23 and 27 should reconsidered and withdrawn.

15

100200239-1   10/052,612

Conclusion:

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is thought to be clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: May 15, 2006

Steven L. Nichols
Registration No. 40,326

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.
Managing Partner, Utah Office
Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC
River Park Corporate Center One
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150
South Jordan, Utah 84095
(801) 572-8066
(801) 572-7666 (fax)

16